

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending and have been examined in the present application. Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Jentoft (U.S. Patent Publish No. 2002/0161629A1). Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ballard (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,050). Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Levergood (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780). Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Simmons (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,451). Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9 and 10 have been hereby amended. Claims 3 and 8 have been hereby canceled without prejudice. Independent claims 11 and 12 have been added. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and below remarks.

Applicant notes that the limitations of canceled claims 3 and 8 have been incorporated in claims 1 and 6 respectively. Claims 11 and 12 have been added to more completely claim Applicant's invention and do not add any new matter. Claims 11 and 12 are amply supported by the specifications on page 6, lines 19-22.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Jentoft. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The method in amended independent claim 1 explicitly requires "providing said user with access to a privileged Website information, in response to said user exercising said privileged access right, said user being supplied with information exclusive to said privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager." Applicant respectfully submits that this feature of the present invention is neither taught nor suggested by Jentoft.

In the process disclosed by Jentoft, the user is informed of the location of a website, the user may visit the website and register and attempt a pre-determined task. If the user is

successful at completing the task, he is provided with a personalized identification number that may be used in conjunction with an access card to receive a cash payment. (See Jentoft para 0012). The method disclosed in Jentoft is completely different from the method of Applicant's invention because in Jentoft the user is not provided "with access to a privileged Website information," as explicitly required by independent claim 1. Similar to the present invention, the user in Jentoft performs a task. However, in Jentoft, the reward for completing the task is providing the user with a personalized identification number which may be used in conjunction with an access card to receive a cash payment. (See Jentoft para 0012). In contrast, in the present invention the user is provided with access to a privileged website. Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in Jentoft of a privileged website as required by claim 1.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner equates the claimed step of acquiring a pre-established privileged access right as a result of participating in an event, with Jentoft's registration step. However, Jentoft's registration step does not require "the user satisfying a condition having some degree of difficulty," as required by amended independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the method in amended claim 1 is patentable over Jentoft.

The system recited in amended independent Claim 6 explicitly requires a "privileged Website information provision means for providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right, and for supplying said user with information exclusive to the privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager as a result of the user exercising said user's privileged access right." Applicant respectfully submits that this feature of the present invention is neither taught nor suggested by Jentoft.

In Jentoft, the registered visitor is provided with a personal identification number which may be used in conjunction with an access card to receive a cash reward. (See Jentoft para 0012). This is completely different from getting access to a privileged website, as explicitly required by independent claim 6. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the system claimed in amended independent claim 6 is patentable over Jentoft.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ballard. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Ballard discloses an advertising method and system for matching a user with an advertisement service provider. (See Ballard Abstract; col 1, line 63 – col 2, line 10; col 3, lines 35-39). The above arguments relating to the patentability of amended independent claims 1 and 6 are equally applicable to Ballard. The method in amended independent claim 1 explicitly requires “providing said user with access to a privileged Website information, in response to said user exercising said privileged access right, said user being supplied with information exclusive to said privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager.” Furthermore, the system recited in amended independent Claim 6 explicitly requires a “privileged Website information provision means for providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right, and for supplying said user with information exclusive to the privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager as a result of the user exercising said user’s privileged access right.” Applicant respectfully submits that these features of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Ballard.

Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner’s argument on page 4 of the Office Action equating this feature of the present invention with Ballard’s registration step is no longer

applicable to amended independent claim 1 because Ballard's registration step does not involve an "event involving said user satisfying a condition having some degree of difficulty."

Furthermore, Ballard does not teach or suggest : "providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right." Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Ballard.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Levergood. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The above-mentioned arguments relating to the patentability of amended independent claims 1 and 6 are equally applicable to Levergood. As discussed above, The method in amended independent claim 1 explicitly requires "providing said user with access to a privileged Website information, in response to said user exercising said privileged access right, said user being supplied with information exclusive to said privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager." Furthermore, the system recited in amended independent Claim 6 explicitly requires a "privileged Website information provision means for providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right, and for supplying said user with information exclusive to the privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager as a result of the user exercising said user's privileged access right." Applicant respectfully submits that these features of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Levergood.

Levergood teaches a method for controlling and monitoring access to network servers. (See Levergood Abstract line 1-2). Levergood does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned unique features of this invention claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 6. In other words, accessing documents on a content server, as described in Levergood, is not satisfying a

condition having some degree of difficulty. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's invention is patentable over Levergood.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Simmons. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The above-mentioned arguments relating to the patentability of amended independent claims 1 and 6 are equally applicable to Simmons. As discussed above, The method in amended independent claim 1 explicitly requires "providing said user with access to a privileged Website information, in response to said user exercising said privileged access right, said user being supplied with information exclusive to said privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager." Furthermore, the system recited in amended independent Claim 6 explicitly requires a "privileged Website information provision means for providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right, and for supplying said user with information exclusive to the privileged Website, said information being provided by said event manager as a result of the user exercising said user's privileged access right." Applicant respectfully submits that these features of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Simmons.


Simmons teaches a network system for distributing bulletins, such as advertisements, to external computers accessing a wide area computer network. (See Simmons Abstract). Simmons does not teach or suggest a user participating "in an event organized by an event manager, said event involving said user satisfying a condition having some degree of difficulty." Furthermore, Simmons does not teach or suggest : "providing access to a privileged website to said user who has exercised this privileged access right." For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Simmons.

Withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 6 on the basis of Jentoft, Ballard, Levergood and Simmons is therefore respectfully requested. Claims 2-5 and 7-12 are dependent on and include all of the limitations of independent base claims 1 and 6. Therefore, all of the above arguments regarding amended independent claims 1 and 6 apply equally to dependent claims 2-5 and 7-12.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in the application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: April 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY
LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

HM/MJS